

## REMARKS

The present application is U.S. Serial No. 10/706,672, filed November 11, 2003. Claims 1-33 are pending in the application. Claims 1-33 are rejected. Claim 20 is objected to. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

### Claim Objections

Claim 20 is objected to because claim 20 depends from claim 29, but it appears that claim 20 should depend from claim 19. In response, Applicant has amended claim 20 to depend from claim 19. Removal of the objection to claim 20 is respectfully requested.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sankrithi *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6405975), (hereinafter referred to as "Sankrithi").

Regarding claim 1, Applicant has added "the aperture further comprises a rotating conical surface" from claim 3 to claim 1. The cited portion of Sankrithi does not disclose or suggest a rotating conical surface. Instead, figures 10 and 11 and column 9 of Sankrithi teach a rotating housing with a clear lens, but there is no illustration, teaching, or suggestion that either the housing or the lens are conically shaped. Claim 1 is allowable over Sankrithi for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and include features that further distinguish from the prior art. For example, Applicants further traverse rejections of claim 6 relating to the Office Notice that it is common knowledge or well-known for the cleaning mechanism to comprise a mechanical brush and demand evidence that the noticed fact is well known. Applicants are aware of no other examples of a cleaning mechanism that includes a mechanical brush that removes obstructions from an outer surface of the transparent aperture. Furthermore, none of the prior art references even hint at such a cleaning mechanism with a mechanical brush.

KOESTNER BERTA LLP  
2192 Main Street  
SUITE 150  
IRVINE, CA 92612  
TEL: (949) 255-7500  
FAX: (949) 255-0500

Independent claim 8 includes a transparent aperture that further comprises a rotating cone. The cited portion of Sankrithi does not disclose or suggest a rotating cone. Instead, figures 10 and 11 and column 9 of Sankrithi teach a rotating housing with a clear lens, but there is no illustration, teaching, or suggestion that either the housing or the lens are cone-shaped. Claim 8 is allowable over Sankrithi for at least these reasons.

Claims 9-13 depend from claim 8 and include features that further distinguish them from the prior art.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Independent claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sankrithi. Claim 14 recites "outputting image of the scenery outside the vehicle to a first display device, wherein the display device is positioned to provide the portion of a desired out-the-window visual scene in combination with a window that provides another portion of the desired out-the-window visual scene." The claimed configuration is shown at least in FIG. 5B and described at least in paragraph [0038] of the present application. In contrast, the cited figure 6A of Sankrithi shows multiple display devices showing different portions of the landing gear, but the display devices do not provide a portion of the desired out-the-window scene in combination with a window that provides another portion of the out-the-window scene. In Sankrithi, the scenes of the landing gear on the display devices is not the same as the out-the-window view provided by the window. Although the display devices in Sankrithi show different portions of the landing gear, Sankrithi differs from claim 14, which requires that the display device and the window show different portions of the scene, not multiple scenes (i.e., the landing gear scene and the out-the-window scene). Claim 14 is distinguishable from Sankrithi for at least these reasons.

Claims 15-18 depend from claim 14 and include features that further distinguish them from the prior art.

Independent claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sankrithi in view of Jamieson *et al.* (6665063), (hereinafter referred to as "Jamieson"). Claim 19 recites features similar to Claim 14, specifically "output the first operator viewpoint image

to the display device, wherein the display device is positioned to provide the portion of a desired out-the window visual scene in combination with a window that provides another portion of the desired out-the-window visual scene." The claimed configuration is shown at least in FIG. 5B and described at least in paragraph [0038] of the present application. In contrast, the cited figure 6A of Sankrithi shows views of the landing gear displayed to the user, but the display devices do not provide a portion of the desired out-the-window scene in combination with a window that provides another portion of the same out-the-window scene. In Sankrithi, the scenes of the landing gear on the display devices is not the same as the out-the-window view provided by the cockpit window. Although the display devices in Sankrithi show different portions of the landing gear, Sankrithi differs from claim 19, which requires that the display device and the window show different portions of the [same] scene. Claim 19 is therefore believed to be distinguishable from the cited references for at least these reasons.

Claims 20-30 depend from claim 19 and include features that further distinguish from the prior art. For example, claim 30 recites "generate a common display area associated with two mutually exclusive windows of information on the display device, the area being customized by the operator to display detailed information". In contrast, the cited portion of Sankrithi does not show the common display area on the same display device as the two mutually exclusive windows of information, as required in claim 30. Claim 30 is further distinguishable from Sankrithi for at least these additional reasons.

Independent claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sankrithi in view of Jamieson. The cited portion of Sankrithi does not disclose or suggest a rotating conical surface. Instead, figures 10 and 11 and column 9 of Sankrithi teach a rotating housing with a clear lens, but there is no illustration, teaching, or suggestion that either the housing or the lens are conically shaped. Claim 31 is distinguishable from Sankrithi for at least these reasons.

Claims 32-33 depend from claim 31 and include features that further distinguish from the prior art.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant believes the application including claims 1-33 is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited. In the event it would facilitate prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (949) 350-7301.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the USPTO on the date shown below:

/Mary Jo Bertani/  
(Signature)

Mary Jo Bertani  
(Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate)

August 6, 2007  
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

/Mary Jo Bertani/

Mary Jo Bertani  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 42,321

KOESTNER BERTANI LLP  
2192 Main Street  
SUITE 150  
IRVINE, CA 92612  
TEL: (949) 350-7301  
FAX: (949) 251-0500